

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NETWORK PROTECTION SCIENCES,
LLC,

No. C 12-01106 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER DENYING
MOTION TO SEAL
(DKT. NO. 260)**

FORTINET, INC.,

Defendant.

On September 5, plaintiff Network Protection Sciences, LLC (NPS) filed a motion to seal documents designated confidential by defendant Fortinet that NPS submitted in connection with NPS's opposition to a motion to strike the testimony of Dr. Keromytis (Dkt. No. 260). Fortinet timely filed a declaration in support of the motion to seal that proposed filing the documents with limited redactions (Dkt. No. 275). Many of these redactions appear reasonable. Some of the redactions, however, are clearly overbroad. For example, on pages 37–38 of Dkt. No. 275–2, Fortinet has redacted a deposition transcript to remove generic references to antivirus work and the fact that a witness worked in an antivirus group. The motion to seal is accordingly **DENIED**. Fortinet may resubmit revised redactions by **SEPTEMBER 26 AT NOON**. Untimely submissions or overbroad redactions will result in the subject documents being filed *in full* on the public docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 24, 2013.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE